

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-12, 14-27, 29-34 and 36-46 were pending in this application. This amendment amends claims 1, 22, 33 have been amended but does not add or cancel any claims. Therefore, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-12, 14-27, 29-34 and 36-46 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 22 and 33 are independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims, as amended, for at least the reasons presented below.

Interview

On March 12, 2007, the Examiner granted an interview to discuss the rejections presented by the Office. The undersigned appreciates the consideration shown by the Examiner in granting the interview and Examiner's courtesy during the interview. While no agreement was reached on the ultimate allowability of the claims, the Examiner agreed with the undersigned that the claims, at least as amended herein, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "one or more parameters for defining one or more workflows for managing identity profiles, wherein said one or more parameters comprise a parameter that defines an operation to be performed on identity profiles as part of said one or more workflows." Claim 1 has also been amended to recite "creating a definition of a first workflow for managing, an identity profile for at least one user, based on said template, wherein said identity profile is used by said access management system to control access by said at least one user to said resources across one or more web servers." Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application, including, inter alia, the prior version of claim 1 and the portions of the specification supporting that claim, as well as at page 3, lines 5-6, page 8, lines 10-20, page 10, line 19 – page 11, line 18, and page 38, line 3 – page 39, line 6. Claim 1 also has been amended to indicate that the definition of a workflow is stored at a mass storage device,

which is disclosed, inter alia, by Fig. 2 (reference numeral 54), and at page 15, line 31 – page 16, line 3.

Claims 22 and 33 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1. Claim 33 also has been amended to remove element headings, so as to prevent any interpretation of claim 33 to require any ordering of the recited elements.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Chang in view of Sakaguchi and further in view of Mein

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-12, 14-27, 29-34 and 36-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,968,503 to Chang et al. (hereinafter “Chang”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,986,138 to Sakaguchi et al. (hereinafter “Sakaguchi”). The Final Office Action also rejected claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Sakaguchi in further view of U. S. Patent No. 6,457,066 to Mein et al. (hereinafter “Mein”).

As discussed in the interview, however, no combination of Chang, Sakaguchi and Mein teaches or suggests the elements recited by claims 1, 22 and 33, at least as amended. Merely by way of example, neither Chang, Sakaguchi nor Mein teaches or suggests either “the access management system accessing a template that indicates one or more parameters for defining one or more workflows for managing identity profiles, wherein said one or more parameters comprise one or more parameters that define an operation to be performed on identity profiles as part of said one or more workflows,” or “creating a definition of a first workflow for managing an identity profile for at least one user, based on said template, wherein said identity profile is used by said access management system to control access by said at least one user to said resources across one or more web servers,” both of which are recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited combination. For at least similar reasons, claims 22 and 33 are believed to be allowable as well. The remaining claims each depend from either claim 1, claim 22 or claim 33, and are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of this dependence. Reconsideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/998,910

PATENT

Amdt. dated: May 14, 2007

Amendment under 37 CFR 1.114 Request for Continued
Examination

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Dated: May 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Chad E. King/

Chad E. King
Reg. No. 44,187

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver office)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver office)

CEK:sbm
60997075 v1